

RemarksAmendments to the Claims


The claims have been amended, as indicated above. The amendment to the indicated claim has been presented in accordance with the proposed revisions to 37 C.F.R. §1.121 as set forth in 1267 OG 106 (25 February 2003). No new matter has been introduced through the amending of the claims.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been disclosed. The Applicant traverses this rejection. The Applicant and the Applicant's attorney would like to thank Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) Walsh and Examiner Joerger for taking the time to discuss the present invention with the Applicant and the Applicant's attorney. As suggested by SPE Walsh and Examiner Joerger during the telephone interview on January 8, 2004, if the specification of the present invention was amended to incorporate the prior art references cited in the specification of the present invention, then the application would be allowed. The specification has been amended, as recommended. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this case is in condition for allowance and now may be passed to issue forth with. A holding to this effect is respectfully requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney during normal Mountain Time Zone business hours.

Respectfully submitted,
Gerard J. Carlson

By 
James R. McDaniel
Reg. No. 34,481

Date: 2/2/04
Phone: (208) 396-34095
Fax: (208) 396-3958